



V
DE

RI

A

WHAT IS CIVILIZATION ?

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN THE CITY HALL, WITH THE VIEW
OF AIDING TO RAISE A BURSARY FUND,

BY

REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE, D. D.,

AND NOW PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIVINITY
STUDENTS OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, AND OTHERS.

KINGSTON:

JAMES M. CREIGHTON, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER.

1859.

NOTICE.

The author finding that he could not comprise within the compass of a lecture, the matter which he had prepared, had to leave a large portion of this matter out of the one he delivered in the City Hall. He has ventured to insert in the copy of the Lecture, now prepared for the press, two or three paragraphs, and a few sentences, which the connection of the sense seems to require. He hopes the gentlemen who have done him the honor to ask for the publication of the lecture, will excuse the liberty he has thus taken.

par
The
zati
wha
us
pro
ans
trat
An
poi
trut
com
way
term
a sy
whi
sens
if th
emb
lang
eve
wha
mar

WHAT IS CIVILIZATION ?

It is quite impossible to give more than a partial answer to this question in a single lecture. There is great diversity of views as to what civilization is—as well as what are the causes of it, or what leads to its decay. The same difficulty meets us here, as in all complex questions; no single proposition can be framed to comprehend a full answer;—explanations of kindred truths and illustrations are necessary to bring out our meaning. An answer in the shape of an aphorism may have point, but must ever, in such cases, be deficient in truthfulness. Besides, the difficulty as to these complex questions is greatly increased by the loose way in which the unthinking employ general terms. A leading term is often made to stand as a symbol for a whole set of ideas, to not one of which these persons possibly attach any definite sense; and yet, they perpetually use the term as if they had a clear apprehension of every idea it embraces. This is a common and vicious use of language. How many have talked of liberty and even fought for it, without any definite notion of what true liberty is. Just so with civilization; many speak and write on this without any just.

notion as to its essential elements, its true benefits, the means for producing it, or the causes of its decay. These indeed, are the persons who most loudly boast of the glory of our modern civilization, and are ever affirming that nothing more is necessary to turn our world into a paradise than its universal diffusion. The loose declamation on this is very foolish and mischievous, and as it springs from confused notions or partial views of truth, diffuses false sentiments, which lead to very pernicious results. A half truth is in most cases a whole error, but the half truths to which I refer, when embraced, can hardly fail to produce the most fatal practical errors. Hence I feel it needful ere proceeding to state my own views, to point out some of the narrow and false notions which have been entertained on this subject.

FIRST. *Many suppose civilization to consist in the great accumulation of wealth among a people.*

I shall shew bye-and-bye that wealth has an intimate bearing on civilization, as well as civilization on the accumulation of wealth. Yet, no mistake can be greater than that wealth in its rude materiality, or in its more refined commercial forms, can of itself either produce or preserve civilization. Except with the insane miser, wealth is but a means to ends; but before you can judge of these as to civilization, you have to settle two questions: *First*, how is the wealth acquired?—*next*, how is it employed? The fact is, mere wealth of a kind may be a proof of barbarism, and may tend directly to barbarize its possessors. Even among ourselves every rich man is not a civilized man, and we know that the riches of many have been

employed not only to brutalize themselves, but others. Helpless poverty may be connected with hopeless barbarism; yet, wealth of itself is neither the cause nor evidence of civilization.

Indeed, I hold that all wealth gotten by immoral practices, such as fraud or oppression, degrades him who thus gets it, as well as those he thus employs as his instruments in getting it. The slave trader, gambler, or smuggler, may amass wealth, but is he a civilized man? or the civilizer of others, either in the methods by which he gains his wealth, or in the ways in which he generally spends it? Wealth gotten at the expense of conscience, or the well-being of our fellowmen, is tainted with an essential curse, for which neither a selfish prudence nor political economy has any cure. It is true the curse that accompanies ill-gotten wealth may not at once be apparent in individuals or communities; yet, it is certain to overtake both in the long run. This is the arrangement of a just God, which may be forgotten, but never can be set aside. The factory system in England has been the means of acquiring great wealth for individuals, as well as for the country. Now, without speaking, which I do not, in unqualified reprobation of that system—yet, who is so ignorant as not to know that as it has been generally carried on, it has tended to reduce masses of the working classes physically, as well as mentally, to great degradation. Yet, cotton mill owners have often realized vast fortunes from a system that was producing these effects on their labourers. The accumulation of wealth, then, among a people—especially when accumulated in few hands—

is not necessarily a civilizing agency, and in fact, may be a great enemy to true civilization. We get dazzled with the splendour of great wealth, and so fail in many cases to see the pernicious means by which it has been acquired, and the demoralizing tendencies that wealth thus acquired may have on a people. But,

SECOND. *Neither do great splendour and elegance, or great excellence in certain of the Arts constitute civilization.*

Yet, this with many is all that is understood by it. I intend by the terms which I have employed to comprehend what is grand or beautiful in buildings—what is exquisite in Art, or what is rich or elegant in dress or equipage.

When the human mind reaches a certain stage in developement and refinement, it naturally seeks to embody its ideas in a material beauty and grandeur,—hence splendid buildings, paintings, statuary, rich dress, and elegant equipage. Now, when this is done according to principles of correct taste, it may embody very noble ideas, as well as embellish social life; yet, it is not civilization. No doubt a true civilization will adorn *its home* with works of Art—for it will seek the beautiful and grand, as well as the useful. Yet, it must not be forgotten that some of the grandest and most exquisite works of Art were produced in times of great barbarism. It were to show a sad ignorance of history to suppose that when some of the most wonderful buildings of Rome were erected, the people of that city were in a high sense civilized. It is well known that some of the grandest buildings of ancient Rome were reared chiefly for the

gladiatorial shows. Thousands of Romans, women as well as men, took their places in these splendid buildings to witness slaves, or vanquished captives, inhumanly butcher one another. No truly civilized people could have beheld without horror the scenes which were witnessed in theatres on which Art, Science and labour had done their uttermost to make beautiful as well as grand. Indeed, as every one knows, some of the finest pieces of ecclesiastical architecture, such as St. Peter's at Rome, the Cathedral of Cologne, and York Minster, were erected during those ages when Europe was immersed in great barbarism. The same is true of some of the finest productions of the pencil. When Michael Angelo was producing those immortal works which fill men with the greatest admiration, it is well known that the bulk of his countrymen were every way thoroughly degraded.

Yet, men are ready to point to splendid buildings and great paintings as decisive proofs of high civilization. But if they be not proofs of this, it may be asked what then are they proofs of? I answer, of great genius and pride in a few, combined with great wealth and physical power, by which true genius could work out its own designs. But this condition of things may be found to exist among a people, the greater portion of whom may be thoroughly ignorant and every way degraded. In fact, some of the grandest national works—Russia has such—never could have been erected but by the will of a despot exercising unlimited authority over a nation of slaves. But this proves at least, you say, that the despot himself with his leading ministers, were highly civili-

zed. It may in no proper sense do any thing of the kind. It may prove simply, as in the case of the Pharaohs of old, or certain monarchs of Russia, how national pride or personal vanity may employ Science, Art and wealth to work out its designs; yet, in all this you may find no evidence of true civilization, even in the leading minds, and certainly no proof from this that the people who wrought as slaves in these great works, were civilized. Nay, more—the erection of some of these works, from the oppression to which it led as to the people, may have tended to corrupt and debase the minds of millions. We do not reflect how much a palace at Thebes, or a triumphal arch at Rome, may have cost of human misery and degradation.

But if palaces, theatres and triumphal arches furnish no certain proof of the civilization of a people, neither does gorgeous dress or equipage. When we read in Eastern story of jewelled dresses, and of horses and elephants covered with gold and sparkling with diamonds, which princes use, we are apt to think of a high civilization. This is a vulgar notion; for it may be all, as Milton expresses it, "but barbaric wealth and gold." Many Eastern princes have illustrated the truth that a man may be a thorough barbarian, yet live in a splendid palace and wear the most costly jewels. As has been hinted, true civilization will draw to itself what is beautiful or grand in Art; yet neither the Arts, elegancies nor rich embellishments in public nor in private life, can of themselves furnish evidence of civilization.

But, indeed, to see the truth of this it is not

necessary to turn to the splendours of oriental princes ; who needs to be told that showey appearances are no certain evidences even among ourselves, of elevation of mind or refinement of taste. Yet, such is the delusion on this, that a certain showy appearance is held not only as the best proof of civilization, but is found to be so indispensable, not only to position, but even *credit* in society, that men make the most desperate efforts to keep up this appearance. I stop not to speak of the deception and ruinous folly of this found on all hands, I merely adduce the fact to shew how readily our minds fall in with the notion that such appearances—for I have no better term—are proofs of high civilization. Such appearances, barbaric or elegant, assuredly may exist where there is a sad want of refined sentiments, intellectual culture, and that high moral worth without which no people can be truly civilized.

THIRD. *A polished mannerism is not of itself civilization.*

By this I understand what in common parlance is called refined breeding. Intercourse in society demands for the easy interchange of sentiments and feelings, as well as for the business of life, certain conventional rules of speech and action. Now, in as far as these rules are in accordance with truth, common sense, and the received usages of society, they are well fitted to give delicacy, ease and facility to social intercourse.—Wilfully to disregard these rules is not mere vulgarity, but gross ignorance, pride, or insolence. He who acts thus, is in no sense a civilized man ; yet, it were assuming too much to affirm that mere

refinement of manners is decisive evidence of those mental qualities that constitute civilization. An artificial refinement of manners, has been often acquired by men who had little head, less heart, and no conscience. Hence, your surface polished man is not always the *gentleman*—far less the man of high principles and just feelings. Besides, what is held as the best manners by one people, is often laughed at as childish folly by another. Again, while among the educated of all nations certain forms of breeding are held much in common, yet in innumerable little things they all differ widely. It may, moreover, be affirmed, that while good sense, gentleness and information, cannot fail but furnish agreeable manners for social intercourse, yet, did a whole people possess such manners they, nevertheless, might have no claim to high civilization. But, the fact is, such refinement in manners is never possessed by more than a small portion of any people. On this, travellers are apt to be deceived. When they meet with a few highly bred persons in the country they visit, they hastily conclude that the whole people are equally refined; or, on the other hand, when they meet with persons of gross manners, they are ready to denounce the whole people as thoroughly vulgar. Either conclusion may be a childish folly. It is readily granted that a certain refinement of manners, gives to society the outer and lighter graces which, although in their place useful and very pretty, must not be regarded as civilization, nor the want of this as a proof of barbarity. But,

FOURTH. *Literature of a sort is no evidence of itself of the true civilization of a people.*

It is true savage nations cannot produce a literature of a high order. This can only be the product of a people who think much and feel deeply. Yet, it were an error to suppose that a condition of society favourable to the growth of genius, must necessarily be highly civilized. Indeed, a poet of creative genius will find some of his best materials among a people vigorously rude, not only in manners and in thought, but even in morals. The truth of this is strikingly illustrated not only in Homer, but in Shakespeare, and in Walter Scott. A great poet must be singularly gifted with an eye to observe and powers to describe truly what he sees. It is, however, an error to suppose that if a country has produced a few men of great genius, that country was on the whole highly civilized. No doubt genius, if properly directed, will mightily aid to civilize; yet, genius itself can live and work amidst very adverse conditions of society. On the other hand, it must never be forgotten, that genius misdirected never fails to corrupt society. Few will affirm that all the productions of Voltaire, Rousseau, or even Byron have tended to advance the true civilization of the world. Whatever demoralizes, barbarizes,—and all the more thoroughly when vicious sentiments are presented with the fascination that genius can give them, and are clothed in exquisite diction, or graced with the charms of poetic numbers. But I have now done with the exposure of these half truths and false views; and I cannot but think if you reflect how the world is imposed on by these as to civilization, you will not deem as irrelevant what I have said.

Society, according to many, is to be regenerated, and indeed saved by civilization. By the sole influence of this all wars are to end, slavery and oppression in every form to be put down; and in short, all poverty, vice and misery to be driven from the earth. This is a sad delusion. Were the delusion, however, merely speculative, it might do little harm, but when it becomes practical—as it does in our day—it is to the last degree mischievous. Civilization is to be the salvation of the world. Be it so; we ought surely on a matter so momentous, to have an accurate notion of what these writers mean by this sovereign remedy for the ills of the world. But on this we, in general, get no thing better than pedantic aphorisms, or vague generalities. With many the civilization that is to save the world is a flourishing commerce. Let us have plenty of trade that is money-making, and the world will be made virtuous and happy. Again, another class of writers make it to consist in education, while their education consists in being able to read, write and cast up accounts. But others take higher ground—with them works of taste and genius, in connection with the universal diffusion of a knowledge of physical science, are the certain means of civilizing mankind. All these theories are very wrong, not because there is no truth in them, but because they are, as we have said, but half truths, or quarter truths, and what is worse, they leave out certain elements which are essential to the *complement* of the theory as a whole truth. I repeat it, a half truth is often a whole error, and when some essential principle is left out, it may become the most pernicious sort

of error. I am far from denying that wealth, taste and good breeding are not parts of civilization ; but I deny that any one of them of itself is it, or that all of them will make it up. Nay, these things so far from being the causes of civilization are in reality, as far as they are good, its effects. In this, as in other matters, men mistake the circumstantial for the essential, a part for the whole, or the effect for the cause.

It is now time, however, that we should try directly to meet the question. *Civilization, then, as to its essential cause* consists in the conscience and intellect of a people thoroughly cultivated, and the intellect in all cases acting under the direction of an enlightened conscience. This is the basis of all true civilization—or to change the figure—it is the *central power* which produces or directs all the other powers that civilize men. When I speak of the conscience of a people, I mean that of the individual man, for before you can have a public conscience you must have individual responsibility to righteous principles. No priest, sovereign or public opinion, must regulate the conscience of the individual, but each must have his own conscience regulated by the will of God. He must believe this to be right, because God requires it, that to be wrong because he forbids it, and he shall do this and eschew that, because the God of justice, wisdom and goodness requires it ; and thus he shall ever think, feel and act as to all the duties he owes to God, to society and to himself. Now, assuming that God has given such guidance for conscience as if attended to, must ever lead to what is good ; plainly, he who

is thoroughly under this heavenly guidance, never can be false in his moral sentiments, or fail in his relative duties. A good moral condition of mind then, is *the first*, and I will add, the *indispensible* element in the civilization of the individual man. Without this you could no more civilize a man, than you could civilize a brute, or a devil. Civilization then, must begin within or there can be no fruits of it without. A God regulated conscience is that which can alone regulate the passions and appetites, and of course the outward conduct of man.

I do not say that this is all that is necessary to give that harmony to the mental powers, and to human energies and labors, which produces and extends civilization. But I do aver that a good conscience is not only first in order to this, but first in importance. Those who have labored most successfully to civilize the outcasts of society, whether among a horde of Hottentots, or among the outcasts of London or Glasgow, entertain not a shadow of doubt on this. These noble philanthropists, with one voice, confess that till they can reach the conscience of the degraded, they can produce no elevation of sentiments, no good habits, no permanent refinement of taste, and no virtuous conduct among them; but as soon as conscience is brought right, it is then easy to bring all else right. This is, indeed, but the old principle:—make the tree good if you would have the fruit good. But if this be true of an individual—which I suppose no one will deny—then it is equally true of ten or of ten millions. Very plainly, the civilization of a nation must begin in.

that nation getting a good conscience, and it will advance just as the national conscience is kept good, and will rise as high and no higher than the morality of the national conscience. Our first principle, then, is that there can be no real or durable civilization till the national conscience is imbued with a divine morality. If any one is inclined to smile or sneer at this, I would bespeak his forbearance for a little.

To proceed then with our argument. While we hold that a divine morality is the basis and safeguard of civilization, we do not affirm that nothing more is necessary for its full development. Reason thoroughly cultivated and working under favorable circumstances, is indispensable for this. Do you say civilization produces intellect, cultivates reason, and directs all their energies? I reply, you again mistake cause for effect. If you intend to elevate the savage or the degraded man in your own community, you must, first of all, enlighten his mind. The want of light is fatal to any safe or useful progress. For till he can see aright, he cannot act aright. A mind in darkness is either imbecile or has only the fitful strength of blind fury;—but this is strength only to destroy. It is the seeing mind that can build up. Hence, you must not only give a man good moral principles, but teach him so to reason, that he shall ever see the true motives for good moral conduct, if you would civilize him; for it is then that his actions are so regulated that all his powers produce good fruits for himself and others. Although I have no faith in the *thing* many call education, civilizing, yet I hold there is a sense in which, if

you educate you will civilize. *Educate the conscience of men*, so that in all their moral conduct they shall ever do what is right in the broad sense, —and so educate their intellect that they shall ever reason correctly on all that relates to them, and you have either civilized that people, or at least put them on the sure way of making great improvement. No civilization without the cultivation of conscience, and reason in connection with conscience, there ever has been, or ever will be. A people that thus reasons well and wisely, must be a civilized people. The Egyptians and Greeks were more civilized than others in ancient times, because on the whole, wise and profound reasoners; and wherever you find a high civilization in modern times, you find it where reason is in connection with an enlightened conscience—thoroughly cultivated.

It is, however, although a common yet a serious error to suppose that our ordinary systems of education generally afford this cultivation of reason. To read, write and know the powers of figures, may be indispensable appliances, and yet the real education of reason be but very partially attended to. It is true without these appliances a man cannot be fit for many situations in life, and can hardly be spoken of, even in a low sense, as educated; yet, why should it not be understood that unless human beings are taught to think closely, love knowledge ardently, and reason justly on what they know, they are not in the proper sense highly educated. Till this is thoroughly understood, we will perpetually mistake the means for the end, and even low means for the great

end. The teacher who merely communicates knowledge to his pupils in a poor mechanical way does little compared to what he does who teaches them to think, love knowledge and reason correctly. It was in this sense that Watt, Stephenson the elder, and Hugh Miller, were perhaps the most educated, although far from being the most learned men of their times. Indeed, he that can reasonably on the subject that comes under his eye is the truly educated man. But need I ask, is this the commodity that is always got in the shape of an education for which no little money has been paid?—alas! alas! The fact is, a people may have a good deal of learning and but little claim to the character of able reasoners. But then let it sink down into your mind that the first principle in man to be educated, if he is to be civilized, is his conscience. If we forget what man is and is destined to be, we can only talk pitiable nonsense about him. Man is a moral creature. He must be looked at in this light if we would see his essential characteristic; but if so, for usefulness and happiness, he must be made morally right. Hence it is the condition of a man's conscience that gives stamp and direction to his whole being, character and aim.

Not that a man can have a good conscience without an enlightened reason. That I utterly deny; but then, I affirm that a well regulated conscience will in the end produce the highest forms of good reasoning among a people. I do not question but mere intellectual force or acuteness—a sort of foxy acuteness, may exist without the power of conscience. In fact, men of this foxy

acuteness would get embarrassed and even stultified in their movement. they happened—a thing not likely—to admit the voice of conscience to be heard in their bosoms. But this granted, still it is true that a vigorous reason acting in harmony with a conscience enlightened by God, and the mind thus conditioned, is in the only proper sense civilized, and cannot fail to become a powerful civilizer. That mind has got the true central force for all great and good actions.

I can see two apparent objections to this, *First*. It may be said were not the ancient Egyptians and Greeks highly civilized? yet, can we affirm that the conscience of either people was in a high moral condition? In answer to this I remark *First*. That I have already shewn that for a people to have among them great works of art is no proof of national civilization. But *Second*. May we not possibly underrate the moral condition of certain ancient nations. There is evidence which I cannot stop to adduce which shews pretty clearly that the early Greeks, as well as the Egyptians, had among them a considerable portion of sound morality, and some just notions of spiritual things. The same may be affirmed of the ancient Mexicans. If the stock of moral truth held by these nations was sadly mixed with error, still the truth—as far as it was pure—had its salutary effects on their sentiments and conduct, and was the chief cause of their national civilization. Every one knows that this was emphatically true of the Romans in the earlier, although not true in the latter ages of their empire. Hence in these latter ages Roman greatness came to be only

greatness in appearance, splendour without reality, and bigness without force. When Roman virtue—such as it was—perished, the empire fell into ruins. The Northern Barbarians were strong and the Legions feeble, because the Roman conscience had lost its ancient power;—not that Roman *virtue* was gone, but true virtue gone. Thus it has ever been. Indeed, did we not know on Divine authority “that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is the ruin of any people,”—all history would teach it. Nor does history teach less clearly that civilization has ever sprung from morality, and that a people becomes great and civilized just in proportion as they are intellectually moral and morally intellectual. It is in the combination of these two forces, morality and reason, that the inner power of civilization resides. Yet, I would have you observe that although these two forces must ever go together, still it is the moral force that is really the leading and supremely influencing one. A conscience in union with God, and ever working in accordance with His truth, is not only a central force for reason, but will so influence it that all the active faculties of man shall ever be properly employed. If men be pious, just, temperate and wise, and if they have suitable means to work on, there is not the shadow of a doubt but they will produce all sorts of great and good results; but if this be true of a few it becomes strikingly apparent when multitudes of such men act in concert. If one virtuous and wise man can do much to elevate himself and a few around him, millions such must have the power of doing this to an extent literally incalcu-

lable. Hence it is that a moral people exercising reason properly are able to produce all those amazing results which are the fruits of civilization, although not civilization itself.

I must try and make this plain. *First, then, as to wealth.*

It has been shewn to be a vulgar notion that wealth is civilization, yet it were still farther from the truth to suppose that high civilization shall fail to produce wealth. There is no fact more obvious than is the connection betwixt immorality and hopeless poverty. A virtuous family, or even a whole people, may, from singularly untoward circumstances, be thrown into poverty;—and in countries where population is in excess of labor and the means of support, many intelligent and virtuous people may have to struggle hard for a bare subsistence. Yet, the poverty of such is not the poverty of the immoral and the ignorant; it is ever decent and respectable. Such poor people are not degraded by their poverty, nor despair under it, but with a brave and persevering courage battle with it, and often rise above it, so that not seldom they, or at least their children, who were nurtured amidst severe privation, but not debased, but rather invigorated by it, are found at length to occupy positions of honour and great emolument. Few sights are more interesting or instructive than the successful battles of poor but virtuous families with their poverty. The conflict is often long and severe, but the triumph most honourable, and the fruits precious and durable.

It is all owing to the superior education which the common schools of certain countries

afford to the poor? Not so; the common schools in certain cases, did their part—an important part—yet, withal not the most important. My friends, it was the moral and *common sense* education which was got mainly in the school of the fireside that did the chief part to raise these poor families above their low position, and fitted some of their members for occupying very high positions.

It is readily admitted that all sound knowledge is valuable, and for the transaction of business certain branches of education are indispensable. No man could manage the affairs of a store, and assuredly never could manage the business of a bank, unless he had a good commercial education. Indeed, without some share of this a man is not able for the humblest business transactions. And yet, on the whole, I would have you note it, that this commercial education, even for the accumulation of national wealth, is but a very subordinate means; the moral power, even for this, is the grand means. I do not deny that money may be made after the Barnum fashion, and other kindred fashions;—just as monkeys and rats may pilfer coin and so accumulate a store of cash; but this is not wealth in the proper sense even to the individual, and certainly in no sense is it wealth to society. That is alone true wealth that is gotten morally and employed for further increase on moral principles. Is any man so dull as not to understand that every penny got dishonestly, is stolen. This is not to increase the wealth of a people, but merely the one plundering the other. No matter, it is at least wealth to him that gets it? This is a childish and immoral delu-

sion. The truth is, God has so ordered it that wealth gotten dishonestly cannot be used beneficially, and in most cases it proves, as has been shewn, a curse both to him and his children who thus acquires it. Nor does this blighting curse come because there has been any want of a cunning prudence to manage property, but because there was a want of right moral power in obtaining it, and the want of this is found in many ways to be fatal to the right employment of it. Men may shake their heads at this and boast of that masterly skill by which even the most questionable speculations can be made to issue successfully and their fruits prudently secured; yet, depend on it that that keenness of intellect or caution that enables some men to amass property in dishonest ways, cannot make that property really wholesome to individual comfort, while the whole business is utterly fatal to public happiness; and little as it may be understood, utterly adverse to the increase of public wealth.

It is no paradox to say that sharpers can only thrive among honest men, just as pirates can only thrive where there is a great deal of honest commerce. I solemnly aver that the man who is making money dishonestly, even within the protection of the law, is undermining the commercial stability of his country. That man is a thief; and were money all that he stole by his *quarkey* transactions, that were little; but he steals confidence, or rather in the end destroys it. But utterly destroy that confidence which is founded on veracity and the whole of your modern commerce would soon become extinct. Believe it,

there is no greater enemy to the increase of public wealth than your smart dishonest man, who by masterly cunning and force of impudence often succeeds in making a fortune. Were such men to become numerous in any community, that community, be its resources what they might, would in a short time be beggared. It is really in this way that the wealth of great nations perish, you know not how. You wonder how such vast wealth has been lost. The fact is, it is *confidence* that has been lost—confidence in human veracity, that is all; but that is enough, if lost, to ruin the greatest nation of modern times. Only think what a mystery our modern commercial system is, from the Bank of England downwards. The real material wealth, or hard cash, as they call it, that keeps the whole of the mighty system in motion, is comparatively but little. I was lately very much astonished on learning from one of our most accomplished bankers, how small an amount of specie is necessary to keep the whole trade and commerce of this Province in active operation, when confidence is in a healthy state. In fact, the whole is kept in motion mainly by bits of paper. But what gives this mysterious and extraordinary power to these bits of paper? Confidence. But confidence in what? I answer confidence in much—but above all, and in a sense comprehensive of all—confidence in the moral truthfulness of your fellowmen. When you look at one of these bits of paper and see a certain name on it, you say it is *good*—as good to you as a bag of gold. Now, how is this?—is it merely because you know the man whose name the paper bears to be a man of

intelligence, a man of business habits, a peculiarly *smart man*? Not exactly, my friends, but because you believe him to be thoroughly honest; you believe what he says on that bit of paper;—in short, to say it in a word, you believe the man to have a conscience. O! don't tell me about the power of commercial honour, legal securities, checks, and all the means of protection. I do not think lightly of any of these, yet I must tell you that were all moral confidence betwixt man and man destroyed, these things—good in their way—could never take its place, and all the wheels of commerce would stop. That cannot be—no, thank God, it may not very easily come to that; yet, do you not see that if the foregoing reasoning be sound, every sharp-set swindler, and every oily-mouthed liar in trade is, with the devil's help, just doing what he can to bring things to this horrible pass. Our conclusion, then, is that a people without a good conscience will grow poorer and poorer. Let us devoutly thank God for this kind of poverty. It were dreadful to think it should be otherwise.

Our position, then, is that a good national conscience is the grand power for producing what is really public wealth, and so far, is greatly conducive to civilization. The reason for this is plain;—such a people can trust one another. Have you thought how much of a nation's prosperity may lie in these few words—*can trust one another*. Such a people can unite with safety, and by their union draw out all the latent resources of a country which shall contribute, when developed, to individual prosperity and public wealth. This

trust which leads to union is well founded. A moral people is ever an industrious and frugal people. A spurious religion may lead to sloth or prodigality, but genuine religion deeply implanted in the conscience brings all the powers of man into full exercise. This produces industry with all the good social habits on which it rests, and conserves all the fruits that spring from it. But I need not tell you that industry properly directed and accompanied with frugality, is the grand agent for producing true wealth. Boundless natural treasures may be lying under the feet of a people, but if they want well directed industry, they never can turn these into national wealth. Nay, so powerful is this when guided by a sound morality for enabling a people to accumulate wealth, that they can hardly fail to grow rich even under very unfavourable natural conditions. Scotland, Holland and New England, are naturally, perhaps, the three poorest countries within the temperate zone; yet, these three countries now possess, I presume, a larger share of wealth in proportion to their extent and population than any others on the face of the earth, while the almost fabulous wealth of England is chiefly the fruit of the industry of her extraordinary people. But then, observe, this industry so essential to civilization, springs mainly from morality, and is mainly sustained by it.—Your own observation must confirm the truth of this, as seen on a limited scale. You know well that the moral and industrious man seldom fails in this country to secure a competency, and not unfrequently attains to considerable wealth;—while the immoral and indolent sink into hopeless pau-

perism, even in the midst of our abundant resources.

But an intelligent and moral people will not only toil laboriously to make property, but will ever have that salutary forethought and keen sense of responsibility, which will lead them while they labor for the present, to lay up something for the future. Although the hoarding of the miser is a sin and unmitigated folly, yet it is neither sin nor folly, but great wisdom, to make some provision for old age or children, and the unforeseen exigencies of life. But this accumulation of property is really the natural increase of the wealth of a people. The desire to accumulate for the ends I have stated, springs and can alone spring from some of the best moral sentiments of the heart. The thoughtless and immoral live from hand to mouth, and even thus live but poorly. If "the love of money be the root of all evil," yet let no one doubt that a total disregard to the lessons of prudence in laying up something for the future, is also the root of innumerable social evils. Nor should it be overlooked that an intelligent and virtuous people, thus wisely making provision for the future, may be entirely free from the sinful love of money. Suffice it to say that property acquired under the influences of a sound morality, and used or laid up for wise ends, must ever have a civilizing effect;—and more especially as the savings of such a people are the fruits of their virtues, so their savings strengthen their virtues.

But these savings never will be made unless there is something like perfect assurance that they

can be preserved in safety, and obtained when needed. Let suspicion as to the security of the fruits of industry and frugality take possession of the minds of a people, and from that moment their wish to accumulate is gone, and all their energies are paralyzed. Should the conviction become universal that no confidence can be placed in the great monetary institutions of a country, either from a want of veracity in the chief managers of these institutions, or a want of integrity in the magistrate to enforce just claims, then the whole financial machinery of that country would come to a dead stop, industry would be ruined, savings would no longer be made—and waste and beggary would become universal. Let a few cases occur in any country like that of the Western Bank of Scotland, or the Borough Bank of Liverpool, and the greater part of men would soon be heard to say,—Let us eat and drink while we have it, for to-morrow we may find our great monied institutions have gone down, and all that we have saved by patient industry and frugality for children or old age, has been lost; let us take the good of it then, rather than have it devoured by careless or cunning knaves. Ah! little do men think how much the civilization and social well-being of a people depend in our times on the ability and stern integrity of a few of the financial chiefs of a country. If these men are not labouring in the front rank to produce civilization, they stand first in the second rank to conserve it. A small number of acute and unprincipled financiers, who can read the signs of the times, may make money on 'change; yet, were the breed of mere sharpers and

speculators greatly to increase, then that confidence which is founded on simple truthfulness, and which keeps the whole apparatus of finance and trade steady and in motion, would utterly disappear. London Royal Exchange might then be turned into a bowling alley for amusement, but never could exist as a mere gambling saloon.

It is, however, the want of confidence to small savings, that is the most fatal form the evil can take among a people. If John Smith, who is a poor man, can securely invest the five pounds he has saved, he will strive to make it ten, or a hundred, so that he may be able to give little Tom a superior education, or make the savings at some future period to minister to the greater comforts of the family. Now, this must help, not only to civilize John Smith's family, but may have a most beneficial influence on several neighboring families. But now, mark it, if Smith has lost his five pounds by some swindling concern, and with this loss has sustained the far greater loss of confidence in every *body*, he will probably take to drinking like Jones, or become as slothful as Brown. In truth, my friends, no words can utter the importance to civilization, when the little savings of the poor can be looked at by them as perfectly secure for a *rainy day*. But this security can only exist among a people thoroughly sound in their moral sentiments. Legislators may enact laws as to pecuniary responsibilities, but they cannot enact laws for conscience, and to this in the end the security must come for its true backing. I wish to drive it into you, that although speculation may make a fortune, yet it is industry that actually

creates the wealth out of which that fortune is made, while stern honesty can alone give security to property after it is acquired. But if this be true, then every dishonest man in business, as he is destroying confidence is sapping the basis of all commercial prosperity. Let me say it plainly, every cheat and swindler is doing his part to plunge his country into barbarism, nor will his splendid equipage in the least mitigate the evil. No vice among a commercial people tends more to ruin and degrade them than falsehood and dishonesty. Never doubt it, stern honesty in money transactions is a mighty help to civilization. Indeed, the truthful honest man is every way a civilizer, while the polished cheat is but a well-dressed barbarian, who is doing his best to sink his fellowmen into barbarism.

Could I command time, it might be easily shewn, *that in matters of mere taste*, the principles which I have laid down are also applicable to the production and embellishment of civilization.

It has already been shewn that great works of Art may exist among a people, neither highly moral nor intelligent. It is nevertheless true, the Arts in a high state can alone continue to flourish among a moral and intelligent people. Such a people can appreciate the truly beautiful and grand in Art, while they alone possess the wealth which can command the labour of men, and especially the labour of genius for such works. Among an ignorant and immoral people, a taste for works of Art is often but a taste for extravagant display, and is rather the dissipation of fancy than just taste. And as we know in reference to Greece,

the finest works of Art when a people become thoroughly degraded, are utterly neglected, or turned to the meanest uses. It is thus that exquisite pieces of statuary and entablatures have been broken up for materials to build cow-houses, or burnt into lime. Art perishes when the intellectual and moral worth of a people perishes. This will be found to hold true, whether applied to great national works, as palaces and triumphal arches, or to private buildings, statuary, or paintings. It may be the fashion to have one or other of these in great excellence; yet, if a people run down to moral effeteness, works of taste will deteriorate, and in the end all true Art disappear. Such a people, if our reasoning be correct, will not have the wealth to sustain Art; and when the heart of a people gets thoroughly corrupted, their taste for the beautiful becomes utterly vitiated.— Savages have no taste. Hence, even for the civilization which depends on taste, you must have a basis of sound morality to sustain true taste.

This is seen with even more clearness in the humbler than in the higher walks of life. It is not in the abodes of the *dissipated poor* that you find the six-penny print, with other little ornaments, but in the houses of the *virtuous poor*. With them, to embellish is not as with the rich—mere fashion, or for effect; it is really the breathing of the soul after the beautiful. Despair of no poor family that adorn their cottage door with flowers, or their chimney-piece with little ornaments of taste. This is not morality nor religion. No, my friends, of itself it is not—yet it indicates some moral health in the breast, and more than one moral element on

which you would do well to lay hold. But, on the other hand, what hope can you entertain for that poor family that is satisfied with the naked and dirty repulsiveness of the cottage walls? If the taste, then, of true civilization—whether in its high or low developements in Art—be not the product purely of the moral sense, yet it cannot exist long in palaces in truthful beauty and grandeur without a healthy morality, and will never exist at all in cottages without the aid of true moral sensibility.

On the *refined manners* of civilized life, to which the principles I have laid down no less fully apply, I can only devote a brief space.

Without stopping to ask what real good breeding is, I simply remark, that the higher forms of civilization must ever possess this. But this also springs from a high morality and sound intelligence among a people. Do not tell me that you have known many good men who had no good breeding, and not a few unprincipled and superficial men, of exquisite manners. I do not pretend to be deeply read in Chesterfield, and so shall not argue the question on the Chesterfield theory and practice; yet, I must deny that the thoroughly moral man has ever the ill-breeding of essential vulgarity, or rudeness. If a plain man, he may be ignorant of forms, but never insolent in his bearing;—he may offend your conventional tastes by a homespun simplicity, so as to cause you to smile at his innocent and awkward blunders, but he will never willfully wound your feelings either by grossness, deceit, or vanity. But now, what of the exquisite breeding of your refined, but

unprincipled man? Yes, he has mastered the theory and practice of the Chesterfield school, and other like schools. Doubt it not—for has he not got the bow artistical, the smile artistical, the hem, the a-wa and the haw all according to the most approved canons and practice? Now all this to a plain man like me does not of itself amount to very much—does not in fact amount quite to angelic excellence; yet to speak it soberly, all this were really something, and something considerable, if it symbolized truly the manliness, gentleness, sincerity, meekness and generosity of the soul. But if all this sort of thing is merely the art which selfishness employs by a smiling tact to gain its ends, while under this pretty symbolism all the while rankles cowardly hate, cunning ambition, prudent deception, or foul appetite—really in that case these graces of manner do not I should say amount to very much, as either causes of civilization, or its true ornaments. Let me not be mistaken—a high, simple, natural, truthful good-breeding is a beautiful ornament of life, and is to some extent the cause of advancing civilization; but how the heartless, unprincipled, superficial and glozing man should possess a good-breeding, which wise men can admire, is a thing to me very incomprehensible. Good-breeding when genuine, as it is the symbol of a good and gentle heart, cannot but civilize—but when not genuine it is a delusion and a lie—and I have simply to say, that adorn a lie as you may, it never can civilize. But then, appearance—O! yes, appearances, all potent appearances—well, to those who are better pleased with appearances than

reality, and can literally take a lie in their right hand and call it beautiful, what can I say? God help them, for I have no help for them, and if I must confess it, not much pity if they are deceived. The truth then forces us to this conclusion, that the good breeding of civilization, as far as it is real is also the outcome of that morality, which can alone teach men truly to love and respect their fellow-men. Yes, it is that which teaches men to exercise gentleness, truthfulness, meekness and forbearance towards inferiors, reverence for superiors and sincere kindness to all. Would not this, think you, make up a sort of good-breeding, which with great advantage to all concerned, might take the place of much that goes by that name? I do not fear to affirm, that were a people thoroughly christianized, they would be the most polite people on earth. The intelligent, high-minded, yet humble christian, is not only the best man, but the best bred *gentleman*. But,

Next, the influence of Literature as a civilizing agency, we affirm also depends wholly on its moral tone.

The power of thought is the mightiest of all powers, as it makes all other powers its servants. Literature taken in its largest sense embodies the thinking of men in its highest forms. It was thus with the literature of Greece and Rome in ancient times, and of Germany, France and Britain in our day. The Literature of a people contains the best or the worst elements of the thinking of that people. The Literature of Britain is moral, rich, varied, lofty and practical, just because for ages the thinking of the people has been in the main

such. It is indeed self-evident, that as the thoughts and feelings of a people are, so will their literature be, and no otherwise. It is true, a people of information, taste and genius, will produce a literature of some kind; but then if the national mind wants morality, their literature cannot have it—but such a literature never can civilize. A literature in the main sceptical, frivolous and licentious, is at once the most powerful, insidious and certain means of leading a people into the worst forms of barbarism. We are now learning something of oriental literature, and from the little I know, I entertain no doubt that the literature of China and Hindostan as it has been for ages, has done much to ruin the national character and sink the people of these countries into that barbarism of a decrepid civilization, in which we now find them. Those familiar with the history of France, know well that the immoral condition of its literature was one chief cause in dissolving the social bonds of society, and in preparing the national mind for the barbarous horrors of the revolution.

I marvel at the way in which even wise men speak of the power of mere literature to civilize. Its power to civilize will just be in proportion as it is imbued with sound morality, without this neither its learning nor genius can wisely elevate, nor safely instruct, nor purify the popular mind. No words can express the power of literature—or which is nearly the same—the power of the Press in our day; but then, mark it, if this mighty agency is giving false views of life, it will enfeeble the intellect of readers, and if it corrupts the heart, it will in the end debauch the popular conscience.

This is painfully true of not a little of the ephemeral literature of our time. But this is fatal to civilization. To depend, then, on literature civilizing, is an utter delusion, unless it teaches men to think wisely—and to think wisely not merely on matters of science and taste, but also on all the subjects that concern them in their relations to God and to their fellowmen. A literature thoroughly imbued with these lessons will diffuse a purifying and healing influence through the heart of society, and give to men nobleness of thought, energy of action, a deep sense of all obligations, refined tastes, and in fine—purity, order and peace to domestic life. This is the literature that will conserve and extend civilization. An immoral literature may please the depraved fancy and tastes of men, by the flowers it scatters; but let them know, assuredly, that these flowers are scattered to allure them down the broad road that leads to national perdition. But,

In fine, what of *commerce* as a civilizing power?

The same answer for substance must still be given. Commerce will civilize, if based on sound morality, and conducted on principles of stern equity; but if conducted on immoral principles, there is nothing—if we except wars of aggression, to which it often gives rise—that will sooner produce barbarism. This I know is clear in the teeth of modern opinions. Only extend commerce, say a set of modern philosophers, and you extend civilization, for in their view the trader is its sole and all-sufficient missionary. Assuredly, commerce in the hands of an honest, generous and

high-minded people, as it calls industry into existence, unfolds and widely diffuses the bounties of Providence, improves taste, corrects narrow prejudices, and produces many excellent social habits, will do much to civilize. But a wicked commerce, or commerce in the hands of unprincipled men, will do the very reverse. Has commerce in the opium trade tended to civilize China? Has commerce in the rum trade tended to civilize our Indians? and has the commerce which Europeans long carried on on the West coast of Africa tended to civilize that continent? Nay, are there not branches of trade carried on here as well as in Britain, which, in the hands of certain men, produce the most deleterious effects on the people? O! yes, there are many honest, high-minded, pious commercial men. Commerce in the hands of these men is every way a civilizing agency. Yet, it is no calumny to say that Mammon is the only God of most traders, and a pure selfishness their sole principle of action. The votaries of Mammon may be skillful enough in making money, and on the whole, know well how to take care of it, but I must be excused for not believing them to be the best missionaries to civilize a sinful and degraded world.

And yet, traders might do much in this. It were, indeed, a glorious day for the world, if all traders that went into barbarous climes were true civilizers. What harbingers would the traders from America and Britain be to the missionaries of the Cross did they, in all their dealings with barbarous and semi-barbarous nations, ever act on the principle "of doing to others as they would be

done by." But when traders, as has been too often the case, cheat the ignorant, plunder the weak, and in every way make their superior knowledge the instrument of injustice, are they, think you, likely to prove very efficient civilizers? It is a philosophy as short-sighted as it is selfish, that prates of mere commerce civilizing the world. Yes, the merchants of every modern Tyre will become mighty civilizers when they consecrate a portion of their gains to the Lord, after having first consecrated themselves to Him.

It has been shewn that many things may, as means, contribute to civilization, if these means are all thoroughly influenced by morality; but then, I trust it has also been made plain, that all means without this must fail. Now, by this mighty power—which must lie at the heart of all and give vitality to all means for civilization,—I just understand *the moral truth of God*; that truth in its principles and motives by which man is taught to love and obey his Maker, and by which he is taught to do justice to his fellowmen in all the relations in which he stands to them, and ever to exercise towards them a wise love, forbearance and charity. In a word, the morality that I plead for as the grand power to civilize is that which a man possesses when he tries to be like God in his moral sentiments and feelings, and tries to act towards his fellow-creatures as God acts towards all His creatures. Would not this, indeed, tend to elevate and refine?—would not this be the true civilization? if men were brought to resemble in their moral qualities and acts that greatest and best of Beings?

But if men will take *Him* as their model and patron, who is the author of all confusion, degradation and misery, shall they be so mad as to hope, under his dominion, for true and lasting civilization? Yes, such is the folly of men, that they fancy they may serve the devil in pursuing all wicked courses, and yet some way or other have an earthly millenium. Although men may become so deluded under the influence of sin, as to call darkness light, and confusion order; yet, darkness and confusion will in the end produce their natural results—debasement and misery.

It is never pleasing to look at the gloomy side of a question, yet I would not do justice either to you or my subject were I not to notice some things which appear to me ominous, even for our modern civilization.

1st. *The low state of subordination* in many countries, cannot but awaken fears as to their civilization.

All law and government—all social well-being and all the liberty that men have in society, depend in a great measure on the respect felt for those in authority. Parents, magistrates, ministers and teachers, if endowed with virtue and talents suitable to their station, must be objects of great respect to those under them, or civilization cannot exist. Yet, few I presume, will venture to affirm that a sincere respect for those clothed with authority is a prominent characteristic of our times. I assume this as a painful fact, without stopping to enquire into the causes of it—and draw this inference from it, that where respect for those in authority is feeble, it augurs ill for the stability of

civilization in that country. Society depends for its very existence on the preservation of order; but if there be little respect for those in authority, then order must either perish or be sustained by force. But while the despotism that sustains social order by force may be a terrible necessity to which men will submit rather than fall into anarchy; yet, this must ever prove fatal to all the higher forms of civilization. Is subordination in the family, the school and the state decaying, then civilization in that country is becoming terribly insecure. No wise man will hastily sneer at this. It may be some time ere *the end* comes, but what that end will be is as plain as it is painful. A building may have the finest cornices and other architectural ornaments, and its rooms may be elegantly painted and gilded, yet if there be a *settlement* in the foundation, you do not feel much confidence in the building because of its upper ornaments. Thorough insubordination wherever it exists, is this rent in the foundation of society. But,

2nd. *Dishonest dealing in the common transactions of life* is another ill symptom of the condition of our modern civilization.

There has been, in all ages, assuredly much dishonesty, yet one cannot help thinking that this has in our age assumed some new and alarming forms. When dishonesty can ply its arts with safety, and bear itself respectably *before* the law, it becomes truly dangerous to society. To explain what I mean.—We have it on the best of evidence that scarcely an article of food can be got in London—and I suppose the same is true elsewhere—

that can be adulterated, that is not mixed,—and often mixed with pernicious ingredients. And what shall be said of that wholesale poisoning by quack medicines, with their lying pufferies? This is, indeed, a new and alarming form, of what is at once unmitigated falsehood and cold-blooded murder. The whole world was filled with horror when a Chinese baker was detected, or but supposed to be detected, poisoning the enemies of his country after his own patriotic fashion. All men cried out what barbarians these Chinese are! And, again, when the Thugs of India were found to be murdering people from the pious wish to please their gods, all Europe was filled with a just horror at the recital of these sacred murders. But now, what shall be said of London bakers, grocers and confectioners—and of quacks every where, who mix up, what according to the writers in the *Lancet*, are deadly poisons, not patriotically to kill the enemies of their country, nor piously to please their gods, but to kill their fellowmen generally, simply for the sake of turning a penny in the way of trade?

Were this flagrant dishonesty to which I refer, with its murderous consequences solely confined to the lowest outcasts, it might well awaken hatred and loathing, but need not produce any serious or general alarm. But this is not the aspect in which the evil must be looked at. *Our* Chinese bakers and Thugs are found every where, and in all grades of society, and withal bear themselves very respectably in society, wearing the finest broadcloth, sitting at the best tables, and acknowledged with no shyness by very respectable men.

Is not all this very bad? In fact, society is ever in an ill case, when dishonesty has become in its modes of action so refined that there is no grossness about it that readily offends you, and withal can keep on very good terms with the law and public opinion, even when it is doing its work very thoroughly. An artful and refined roguery in business is what our civilization has very much to dread. For it has already been shewn that falsity in speech and trade, if widely prevalent, must imperil the civilization of any people. But,

3rd. I cannot but think that the growing practice—especially on this continent—of *assassination* is another thing that augurs ill for our modern civilization.

It is true, deeds of violence have ever been common among a people of rude manners and feeble morality; but assassination is essentially the vice of a cowardly and barbarous mind, inflamed by virulent malignity, without the boldness of open revenge. There is only one thing necessary to complete the dark picture, and that is, when the assassin is screened by popular sympathy, or allowed to escape when brought to trial through the moral cowardice of jurors or witnesses. We boast of the triumphs of science and art—they are indeed wonderful, for you can now travel by their agency in a few hours on an easy-cushion in our cars a distance that would have required many days of sore toil but a few years ago; yet, what will this avail if it be found that one of the most necessary things for your journey is a revolver, and that before you can lie down with safety to take your nap, you must see that the revolver is

at hand, and in order? And what will it avail for real happiness that you may live in more splendid mansions than your fathers, if you have every now and then during the night to look out to see that the man who has some ill will to you is not collecting his shavings and opening his box of matches at the back of your premises? Ye people of Kingston, is all this fiction? You know it is not, and you ought to know that wherever this prevails, civilization must in the end perish. Assassination and arson—and the latter virtually involves the guilt of the former—cannot grow to a head among a people without sinking them into barbarism. I tell you it is not the timid, but the brave man, who is appalled at the growth of these crimes and is filled with horror when he sees how the perpetrators of them are allowed to escape, either from a want of right popular sentiment, or from a want of honest and vigorous action in our judicatures. Any convulsion in a community in this condition, and the whole fabric of social order may in a few short months be shattered to pieces. But,

4th. *The infidelity of the times*, especially among men who lead public opinion, whether through the Press or otherwise, cannot but have a pernicious effect on civilization.

I do not know that this evil as yet prevails to a very great extent in this Province. It cannot, however, be questioned that Atheism in some of its unqualified and insidious forms prevails extensively in several of the seats of modern civilization. It is not generally known that this moral pest preceded the downfall of civilization, both in

Greece and Rome. Like causes necessarily produce like effects. It is true we have christianity to oppose to modern infidelity, still it is plain if infidelity prevails among the leading men of a country, the social condition of that country must fall into dissolution. Who can doubt this—utterly disown God as Creator, Lawgiver and Judge, and civilization and social order could no more exist than light and order could exist after the sun was removed from our system. It is no paradox to say, that that learned and polished sceptic who saunters gracefully through elegant drawing-rooms, is the apostle of barbarism, and were he successful in teaching his lessons, he would land all men in the lowest savageism. It has been stated that we have christianity to resist infidelity, and there is, indeed, no other power that can successfully resist it; but if christianity has become feeble through its divisions and worldly mindedness, it then wants the Divine power, by which alone it can oppose this enemy of God, of man, and of all civilization. Of the final issue of the conflict betwixt truth and error, there is no ground for fear; yet, who can tell what a conflict the world may have to witness, and what wreckage of civilization the powers of darkness may make ere they are finally overcome by the powers of light, order and peace.

I might have noticed other causes that are ominous enough, but for want of time I must forbear saying more.

Before concluding, let us turn for a brief space to the *bright side* of the picture, for assuredly we have abundant grounds of hope of a widely extended and far higher order of civilization than

the world has yet seen. I shall only notice a few of these grounds of hope,—and must do this in the briefest possible way.

FIRST. *The triumphs of physical science* in our times furnishes ground for hope.

There can be no question that science dealing successfully with the great laws of nature, is now unfolding material means for human enjoyment to an extent that is perfectly marvellous. To see the truth of this, you only need to reflect on the wonderful discoveries made of late in chemistry, or on the application of science to create power for locomotion and other purposes; as well as its amazing improvements in agriculture, by which the produce of the earth is so prodigiously increased, or its application to sanatory purposes, by which human health and enjoyment have of late been so wonderfully secured. What science has done in these and in other ways, by discovering certain laws of nature and wisely working these within the present century, seems rather like wild fictions from the Arabian Nights, than the simple facts and grand realities which have been produced.—Now, all this labour of science—and we may suppose it only begun—cannot but contribute not merely to the material enjoyments of men, but also to the enlargement of their thoughts and refinement of their tastes. To the realizing of our most sanguine anticipations in this, it is simply necessary that science in her labours shall never forget God, and shall ever consecrate all the fruits of these labours to His glory. If this be done, science cannot fail to prove an efficient handmaid to civilization. But,

SECOND. *The new forms by which the communion of the mind of the world is now kept up,* must also be favorable to civilization.

There is a sense in which we may say soberly enough, that thought is the soul of the world. But in former ages, thought moved slowly from mind to mind even in the same country, and still more slowly from one country to another. If we look back but a few ages, we find that books for the people were few and readers not numerous, hence the best thoughts of one man were long in reaching any great number of his fellow-men. Even genius then was long in gaining any large audience. Not so now. The thoughts that spring up in any mind at present, whether scientific, literary or religious, soon find their way into all lands. But if this be true of the bound volume, as it disseminates thought, it is, in a sense, even more so of the periodical press. What an instrument is this now become as a distributor of thought! There is not a village newspaper but speaks to a larger audience than ever listened to Demosthenes;—while the *London Times* may be said to have the whole world for its audience. What were the advantages of an ancient orator, even in the Roman Forum, compared to the advantages possessed by the mighty speaker in Printing house square? The able article that issues thence, is, in a few days, read by all reflecting men from Canada to Georgia, and in a few weeks it has been read in Calcutta, Melbourne and Canton. But why speak of days or weeks before thoughts that have sprung up in a British brain, shall reach far off lands? The present year may not close

ere a leading article, published in a British periodical, may be published in Kingston or Bombay, before the printer has had time to put off his inky jacket in London or Edinburgh. How marvellous ; truly if all nations are not in union now, they are, at least, in mental communion. The thought of the world will soon not be here or there, but as it were, everywhere at once. Does not this look like the reign of mind?--and if mind were pure and godlike, this communion and diffusion of it could not fail to extend civilization, and give it an elevation to which it has never yet attained. But,

THIRD. *The breaking up of the isolation of different portions of the human family* may help to extend civilization.

Till now, more than one-third of the human race was literally shut up from all the influences of European civilization. China is now open to these influences, and so is Japan, and so, indeed, is every land. This is obviously a new condition of things for the human family, and as we are all children of the same Heavenly Father, that isolation which has hitherto prevailed, must have been adverse to the improvement and happiness of man, as it was plainly not in accordance with the social order of God's Universe. Of course, this breaking up of the isolation of peoples may lead to very dreadful consequences. The hope is, that when the bad and the good influences meet, the good may overcome the bad, and so order, peace and civilization may follow. There is, at least, something grand in the thought, that as God has made of one blood all men that dwell on the face of the

earth, so all men are now being won or forced to own one another as belonging to the same great family, who are henceforth to hold intercourse together. O! that they all knew their one common Father, and their one Saviour, then would they live as brethren in high civilization. But—

LASTLY. *The modern efforts to extend christianity.*

This is, indeed, as may be inferred from what has been already stated, the chief ground of hope for the civilization of the world. How is it possible to doubt this?—a system that is capable of raising men to a fitness for dwelling with angels in heaven, and for sharing in their service and joys, must surely possess the highest power for civilizing men upon earth. Hence, the Bible is the chief book after all, for civilizing the world—and were its truths believed and reduced to practice, it would do for the most barbarous nations, just what it did for that savage band of mutineers on Pitcairn Island. I need not speak of the vast efforts now in being made to disseminate the Bible throughout the world, so that all men may read the revealed will of God in their own tongue. The British and Foreign Bible Society publish more copies of the Scriptures in one year now, than were possibly published in all Europe during the sixteenth century. This, take it all in all, is the grandest effort of modern philanthropy, and holds out the most cheering hopes for the best interests of man. But if the Bible can do so much to civilize, may I not add, that he that ably expounds it by his lips and his life, is the most efficient of civilizers. Without the ministers of religion, the world never

can be civilized,—and did all the pulpits of our land exhibit gospel principles and moral truths in their fullness, power and beauty, the land could not fail but be full of peace, prosperity and order. This is ever seen wherever you find an able, pious and zealous ministry. Still, the truth of it is more strikingly apparent in heathen lands. In fact, all the conquests made for civilization, in modern times, have been made by Missionaries with the word of God in their hand, and its principles embodied in their life. These simple-minded and self-denying men have been the true creators of civilization—for by their labors, whether on the coast of Labrador, in the Islands of the South Sea, or in South Africa, the moral “desert has been made to blossom as the rose,” for in the most beautiful way, order, peace, happiness and virtue, have been made to take the place of confusion, bloodshed, and every sort of debasement. Indeed, no axiom is clearer than this—that henceforward civilization must lean entirely on Christianity, as well as spring from it, for let it be well understood that all the ancient systems which less or more conserved it, are now worn out or rapidly wearing out, so that they can never again be employed for its support. Feudalism is dead, the song of the Bard has lost its power on the popular mind, and Chivalry, whatever it may have done, has done its work and is gone for ever more from the earth.

But, then, have we not philosophy—all potent philosophy—to civilize? Let me say a word on this. Philosophy, properly so called, has never civilized and never will civilize the popular mind. For this great work from Plato down to Jeremy

Bentham, Philosophers have all been miserably inefficient, while the wisest of them have frankly confessed their inefficiency. As far as the ancient world was civilized, it was not philosophy that did it, but that moral truth which had come down from the fathers of the human race, and which, while firmly held, produced the best effects. Philosophy never bore herself more proudly than when ancient civilization was falling into ruins. Christianity, not philosophy, saved the remains of civilization in the ancient world, and then carried civilization into those lands which the arms of Rome had subdued, but not civilized. But if philosophy can do so much, why does she not go with her theories of human perfectability, and "Constitutions of man," to barbarous nations, and try her hand on the degraded and miserable outcasts of humanity? For this she has neither the heart nor the power. She can talk civilization in her own coteries, but cannot raise the degraded: in fact, she feels such are alike unworthy of her lessons, as they are incapable of being benefitted by them, and thus she draws from her very impotency in this matter, a compliment to her pride.

Philosophy may sit as a queen on her throne, if she only teaches Science and Art, but if she attempts to be an instructress in ethics and to lay down principles for social life and civil government, she will utter nothing better than pretty rhetoric or feeble logical theories, to which men may listen, or on which they may curiously speculate; but from which they never can draw principles that shall bind their conscience or regulate their moral conduct. "Philosophy has no Sinai,"

no Calvary, no Omnipotent Judge, and alas! in no sense, any Saviour for men. If she works behind the Cross and with her eye reverently fixed on the Bible, as well as on *nature*, she will do great things for the world. But if she despises the Cross and casts away the Bible, she will only prate like a learned fool, or set the world on fire by her atheistical dogmas. "Oh! that men were wise and understood this," for if they do not understand it, then is our civilization, with all its splendid achievements, a doomed thing. But no—God reigns, in this is our hope.

! in no
behind
on the
things
ss and
like a
atheis-
se and
and it,
lendid
—God